

Approved

Terminal Facilities and EIR Referral Issues Study Committee Airport Advisory Commission

Minutes for Meeting #8

May 20, 2004

MEMBERS

PRESENT

Ron Salk
Bruce Alton
Bernhard Clever
Douglas Haubert
Bob Luskin
Carol Soccio
Deborah Veady
Don Temple

MEMBERS

ABSENT

Alan Fox

STAFF

PRESENT

Chris Kunze
Dottie Jones
Sharon Diggs-Jackson
Ken Ashmore
Sileneka Smith
Malcolm Oscarson

OTHERS

PRESENT

See Attached sign-in
(Available on request)

Call to Order

Chair Ron Salk called the Study Committee to order at 6:25 p.m., at the Long Beach Energy Department.

Roll Call

Chris Kunze called roll and certified that a quorum was present.

Minutes

The minutes for the meetings of April 15, 2004 were approved.

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

Chairman Salk Opening Statement

Chairman Salk thanked the public for attending. Chairman Salk stated that the minutes are on record and are accessible on the Airport website www.lgb.org, or request a copy from the Airport Administration Office.

Chairman Salk stated that the purpose of the minutes is to capture all of the comments to assist the Committee in making informed recommendations to the City Council. Chairman Salk reviewed the contents of the May 27th meeting, JetBlue Airways, Long Beach convention & Visitors Bureau, and LBHUSH2 will make the last of presentations to the Committee. He stated that June 17th will be reserved for open discussion among the Committee members, leading to making a recommendation to the City Council in July. He stated that the Committee will have held 10 meetings, and believes that all voices have been heard, and at the June 17th meeting, there is another opportunity for the public to speak. Chairman Salk thanked the public for the input given, the community groups, and to everyone who took the time to speak.

Chairman Salk introduced the first presenter, Ken Velten.

Mr. Velten stated that he is a past member and past Chairman of the Airport Advisory Commission, and volunteers at the Airport as a tour guide/ambassador, and enjoys staying involved with Airport as well as being a resident of Long Beach. He stated that he has been attending the Study Committee meetings since January, and offers his brief point of view. Mr. Velten gave his presentation as follows:

I believe that there is a reality of having 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights into the Long Beach Airport. This Airport is convenient to the rest of southern California. People like it for its convenience, want to use it, so there will be the 41 flights. If it is not the current four airlines, it will be some other airlines, there is too much demand on the airports in southern California for someone to decide that they will not use Long Beach. Given that there will be 41 flights, lets look at who is impacted if there is no improvement to the facilities. The present passengers like the convenience of the airport, but are stuck with temporary facilities, hard to access the gates, the waiting areas are small, the baggage areas are dimly lit at night, and in using the long term lot, who is using the long term lot but people that are traveling for a long period of time, have large suitcases. If you have used the lot, you know you have to lug your suitcases on and off a shuttle bus, which is a problem using that lot, but if you are going on a long trip, that is what should be used as it is the cheapest. There is no good place for people to wait for flights, arrivals, it is something that has changed over the years, and with 9/11. Long Beach is not unique in that area, but if the terminal is not improved, it will stay that way. The food service areas are small, crowded, and insufficient. Hopefully the Committee will have an opportunity to see the Airport in action, people like the Airport, but the facilities do not make a good impression to the people arriving into Long Beach or people from southern California choosing to use LGB because the facilities are convenient. I recommend to you that you approve the improvement of facilities to accommodate 41+25 flights. Since there will be the flights anyway, there is no benefit to the residents that live under the flight path and are impacted by noise by not improving the terminal. If the improvements are not done, you are not helping those residents, because they will have the flights overhead anyway, but you do impact all the people, including the residents that use the Airport and all the other people that come to Long Beach and have to put up with sub-standard facilities. Civic pride says we want to make a good impression. Our City depends on a lot of tourism, we want to have a nice airport for people to use coming and going. One more argument is if we do improve, have meetings, go through this long process, hire consultants, and say yes we should improve the facilities for 41 flights, and someone comes in to say they want more flights, the argument would be that you have already improved it to 41 flights, have done all the work, have gone through all the effort, that is the size, and it will not accommodate anymore than 41 flights. If nothing is done, someone could argue that you knew that there would be 41-flights and did not bother to make improvements.

My view is to urge you at the end of the day, when all the input has been provided to you, to remember that there will be 41-flights, you would hurt the passengers and people that use the Airport if the facilities are not improved. A final word, the effort that the Committee has put forth in behalf of the City is appreciated, and we know that it is an unpaid effort. To go through 10 meetings is admirable, that the Committee is willing to do that for the sake of the City and the community. Also, a compliment should go to the Airport staff in being very professional and I am proud to be associated with the Airport, and everyone is doing their best to come to a decision.

Commissioner Alton asked Mr. Velten what he believes is a sufficient increase in the size of the terminal. He stated that the present square footage total is approximately 92,000 square feet, with proposals ranging to an average of 250,000 square feet. He asked if increasing to two and a half times the size of the existing square footage is sufficient, or excessive to make it more convenient to use the Airport. Mr. Velten stated that he is not an expert in square footage, but the Airport needs to serve people. He stated that the input from the consultants that are the experts would be valuable information, and stated that he believes the Terminal should be larger than it is today. It is clearly too small for present operations. Commissioner Alton asked if he had an opinion about how much bigger it should be. Mr. Velten stated that it should be sized to fit the available data presented, and use a peak day, not the very peak, but a peak day of a regular month. Commissioner Alton asked if he sees a time when the terminal would be just a crowded with those facilities as they are today. Mr. Velten stated that probably not if it is sized properly, and that there is not the probability of going to a larger aircraft, that Long Beach will be served with B-757, A320, variety of airplane. He stated that if the terminal were sized for standard loads on those aircraft, that that is what this Airport would be good for. Commissioner Alton asked for his opinion as to the number of flights. Mr. Velten stated that 41 is the maximum. He stated that as long as he has been associated with the Commission, 41 has been the bible, and have always wanted to work towards that number and nothing more.

Chairman Salk stated that there would be tours of the Airport scheduled for June 4th and June 6th, and are duplicated tours for a choice of convenience. Ms. Diggs-Jackson stated that she would need to have a confirmation of attendance to give to security for access to the boarding lounge.

Mr. Chris Kunze stated that before the next presenter, that there are three documents available as handouts, the HNTB report, a PowerPoint summary of that report, and excerpts from an FAA Advisory Circular on terminal design which is the basis for the consultant's recommendations. Mr. Kunze stated that the presentation will be in three parts, with the umbrella group being HNTB. He stated that Part 1 will be presented by Vince Mestre, of Mestre-Greve Associates, who will be looking at the maximum level of airline activity under the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. He stated that the Ordinance requires that the Airport provide a minimum of 41 + 25 flights. He stated that staff is proposing to design terminal facilities to accommodate that level and nothing more. He stated that for the EIR, to look at potential impacts of having more people than the design criteria, and to know the impacts of the facilities, or additional activity over and above the 41+25, staff asked, through HNTB, Vince Mestre to look at the number of airline flights over 41 and over 25 commuter, which could plausibly be accommodated within the noise budget, which is the CNEL during the baseline year of 1989-1990. He stated that staff is not recommending to design to that scenario, but it is necessary to know the information for impact assessment of the designed facilities. He stated that the second part will be a forecast of passengers and aircraft activity given the minimum 41+25 activity levels under the Noise Compatibility Ordinance, and that will be presented by HNTB. He stated that they have looked at an industry standard of a peak month, average day, and in some cases a peak period during that day to determine the demands on the terminal facilities. He stated that part three will be taking passenger forecasts and looking at the facility recommendations from HNTB based on different industry benchmarks and metrics of both FAA Advisory Circulars and what the industry recommends. Mr. Kunze stated that HNTB have looked at sizing scenarios significantly less than what the

industry standard might be, because of site constraints. He stated that staff intends to review the HNTB recommendations, the public input, the presentations for next week, and give a staff recommended proposal in terms of facility improvements, to the Commission on June 17th for consideration. Mr. Kunze introduced Mr. Mestre to begin the presentation.

Mr. Vince Mestre stated that he is a principal of Mestre-Greve Associates, and is the acoustical engineer that tracks the budget status on a monthly basis, and will be presenting on the flight activity analysis. Mr. Mestre gave the presentation as follows:

The purpose of this analysis is to present the results of an analysis to determine the realistic number of flights that could be accommodated under the Long Beach Airport Noise Budget if airlines used an optimized fleet and reduced the number of nighttime operations. The assumptions used to develop this analysis are based on making realistic assumptions about the fleet and time of operations as opposed to an idealized fleet with no night operations. In this context, realistic was defined according to the following rules:

- *Each airline will continue to operate in its current market. For example, JetBlue will continue to operate primarily to the east coast (with high operating weights) with some flights to short destinations (with low operating weights). The important aspect of this assumption is that JetBlue will not switch into a short haul carrier, only serving Oakland, Las Vegas, Phoenix and the like.*
- *For each airline, the fleet used at Long Beach will be the quietest aircraft that is currently in their fleet or the airline has firm orders to acquire that aircraft. In other words, airlines will only fly aircraft they currently own or are committed to purchase.*
- *The nighttime penalty for operations between 10 p.m. and 7a.m. is significant. There were many night operations in 2003 (415 night operations over RMT 9 and 251 night operations over RMT 10 during the 2003 budget year. 10/1/02 through 9/31/03). For purposes of this analysis it was assumed that the airlines will improve their night operations record and reduce night operations in order to get more flights. However, the airlines will not achieve perfection and eliminate all night flights. Weather, air traffic and security delays will continue to result in some of the number flown in 2003. There is no way to accurately forecast the number of night operations. The purpose of using an assumption of a 50% reduction in night operations is to determine the effect of this dramatic drop in night operations on the number of additional flights that can be accommodated.*
- *If the fleet mix and number of night operations are optimized such that more than 41 flights can be accommodated at Long Beach, the number of additional flights will depend on how many of the new flights occur during the evening and night hours. The more of the new flights that occur during the evening and night hours, then there can be fewer new flights. For purposes of this analysis, it was assumed that all new flights will be distributed throughout the day according to the present distribution of flights, with reduced night operations. Specifically, based on the 2003 budget year, 28% of any new flights will occur during the evening hours and 1.7% will occur at night. Note that the 1.7% night operations reflects a 50% reduction from the actual level of night operations flown in budget year 2003 (3.3%) to reflect the previous assumption of a 50% improvement in night operation levels.*

Fleet Mix Assumption by Airline: *The following aircraft substitutions were made to optimize*

the fleet mix according to the rules outlined above:

- *American Airlines exchanges all of their MD80 operations for B737-800 aircraft.*
- *Federal Express exchanges all B727 aircraft for A300 aircraft.*
- *JetBlue exchanges one-third of their A320 aircraft for E190 aircraft (this assumption is high toward the E190 relative to the assumption that JetBlue continues to serve primarily east coast destinations, however, the E190 may be used on some domestic long haul flights and therefore was included here to ensure that a future scenario in which JetBlue moves many E190s into Long Beach is accounted for).*

Resulting Additional Potential Flights: *The number of potential additional flights beyond the base 41 flights is dependent on the type of aircraft that is added and whether that aircraft is flown heavy (long haul destination) or flown light (short haul destination). Table 1 shows the sensitivity of the number of additional flights to aircraft type and the time of the flight.*

Table 1
Number of Potential Additional Flights* By Aircraft Type

	<i>Base Aircraft**</i>	<i>Heavy A320</i>	<i>Average A320</i>	<i>B737-800</i>
<i>New flights 28% evening and 1.7% night</i>	6.4	7.6	11.3	7.8

**Beyond the minimum 41 daily flights allowed in the budget.*

*** Base aircraft in the budget is defined as an aircraft that produces a noise exposure of 65 CNEL for 100 daytime flights.*

Table 1 shows that the number of potential new flights is sensitive to the aircraft type. For example, if the new flights are a heavy A320 (east coast destination) then there is the potential to have 7.6 additional flights, but there may be as many as 11.3 additional flights if the A320 is flown at a lighter weight, i.e., to a closer destination. The City of Long Beach would have to allocate any additional flights based on a commitment to operate specific aircraft types and destinations.

Mr. Steve Morris, Vice President of Aviation Services for HNTB stated that at their last presentation they talked about what really goes into planning airports, what is involved in forecasting and planning facilities. He stated introduced, Mr. Pat Cannon, Senior Planner for Forecasting, and is the Director of Forecasting for Aviation for HNTB and Mr. Joe Grogan, Senior Principal Planner for Facilities, and Director of Aviation Facilities in the western United States. Mr. Morris stated that they will review what goals are involved and what is involved in that, what is involved in the forecast, what are the assumptions that are made, and what are the expectations coming out of that. Mr. Cannan will give a detailed presentation on those issues. He stated that then Mr. Grogan will review those forecasted analyses and review the facilities scenarios from those forecasts. He stated that at the end of their presentation, they will have an opportunity to make recommendations.

Mr. Pat Cannan presented the passenger activity forecast developed for Long Beach. He stated that there will be six key points: the purpose of their forecast, the general approach used, the two scenarios that have been developed, the key assumptions that went into the

forecast, the forecast schedules, and a description of their results. He stated that the purpose of developing their forecast, is to provide a basis for estimating the facility requirements that would be used to assess potential impacts of the alternative options for the terminal building. He stated that the forecast is intended to be a reasonable estimate of what is likely to occur at the Airport, and is not intended to be an assessment of what should or should not occur. He stated that their approach for Long Beach differs from the approach taken at most other airports. Typically at other airports, they start from a non-constrained standpoint, they look at the demand factors such as the economy, and airline fares and see what the potential growth is at the airport. He stated that the case is different with Long Beach, as the maximum activity levels are determined by the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, so that the forecast is focused on identifying the maximum activity levels that could reasonably occur given the noise ordinance and any market driven distribution activity throughout the day. He stated that they have been asked to develop two alternative scenarios, 1) assumes the noise ordinance operates as it currently is, 41 daily air carrier flights and 25 daily commuter flights, 2) builds on Mr. Mestre's analysis, and assumes additional flights based on staying under the noise ordinance, which could range for 6-11 potential additional air carrier flights depending on the type of aircraft and they time of day. He stated that by Mr. Mestre's report, the noise budget could probably not accept any more commuter flights and would stay at 25 under scenario 2. He stated that the critical assumptions that went into the forecast are a 20/20 time horizon, with no change in the noise ordinance. He stated that they did assume that passenger demand is sufficient to justify service up to the limits permitted by the noise ordinance, which is from studies developed mainly for LAX, where it was determined that 20% of the local demand in the Los Angeles area would want to use LGB. He stated that under scenario 2, they assumed that any future slot allocation would be based on the terms of the agreement between the City and the air carriers. He stated that they assumed that airlines would only operate aircraft currently in their fleets or on order, and finally they assumed load factors on the aircraft would increase at the same rate that the FAA projects nationally. He stated that the core of their effort was to come up with forecast schedules for each scenario. He stated that these provide the basis for the facility requirement analysis, and stated that they developed a separate schedule for each scenario. He stated that the level of detail includes flights by airline, by aircraft type, market, time of day, and the number of passengers on each flight. New schedules were estimated using existing airline schedules and strategies in terms of the kind of markets they serve, the type of aircraft they fly by market, and the existing connecting bank structure at destination airports. He stated that the commuter service is assumed to be mostly O&D, and includes some feeder flights to other hub airports. He stated that the results for analysis come in six key categories: passenger enplanements for passenger boardings, passenger deplanements for disembarkations, total passengers which is a sum of enplanements and deplanements, passenger aircraft flights, gate requirements, and aircraft parking requirements. He stated that the table shown on the handout summarizes the results of the passenger enplanements forecast. The categories are peak 20 minutes, peak 60 minutes, average day, peak month, with the peak month typically occurring in the summer, July or August, total passengers in the peak month, and annual enplanements. He stated that the enplanements numbers are typically used to estimate facilities such as ticketing and baggage makeup. He stated that the peak period for enplanements typically occur in the morning with the initial departure peak, around 7 a.m.. He stated that the annual numbers are forecasted to rise to 2.1 million enplanements in scenario 1 and 2.5 million in scenario 2. He stated that the table labeled passenger deplanement forecast shows the same numbers except for deplanements. He stated that the deplanement peak shown tends to occur late in the

evening, between 9 pm –10pm. He stated that those numbers are used to size facilities such as baggage claim and other facilities depending on deplaning passengers. He stated that deplanements over the year and over the month, tend to equal enplanements, showing that annual numbers are typically the same. He stated that the table showing total passenger forecast, showing the same forecasts, and that the annual numbers are projected to go from approximately 2.9 million to 4.2 million for scenario 1 and up to 5.0 million for scenario 2. He stated that in the past, the forecast for the maximum million annual passengers that LGB has been 3.8 million. He stated that that was assuming 41+25 scenario. He stated that their figures are slightly higher for two reasons; 1) the original forecast assumed an average 50 seat size for the regional commuter aircraft, and now it is assumed a 70 seat average size which falls under the weight restriction for commuters, and 2) load factors, the previous forecasts were done prior to JetBlue's entry into this market. He stated that JetBlue has realized large load factors, and HNTB has reflected those load factors into their forecast, hence the increase. He showed a table depicting the hourly distribution of total passengers. He stated that the graph is unusual of airports in the west coast. Typically, the last peak is no higher than other daily peaks, and the reason it is intensified at Long Beach is because of the nighttime noise restrictions. He stated that at most other airports, the redeye flights would depart at 11 p.m. Those flights occur between 9p-10p at Long Beach. He showed a table of passenger aircraft flights on the existing case and each scenario, and he used April, 2004, for existing. Since that time, JetBlue has added another flight, so it adds another number to the forecast. He stated that the main difference between scenario 1 and the existing case is the addition of the 25 commuter flights, and scenario 2 reflects the additional average of 9 air carrier flights. He stated that requirements for aircraft gates are associated with departure lounges and are needed to accommodate aircraft that are loading or unloading passengers. He showed a table for gate requirements and gate sizes for 757, other narrow body, and regional jets. He stated that aircraft parking requirements are slightly different than gate requirements. In addition to the parking required for gates, there is the parking required for remaining overnight aircraft, and allow parking for one spare aircraft and parking for one off-schedule aircraft. He reviewed the aircraft parking requirements table saying that there are 10 parking spaces, now. Under scenario 1, it increases to 16, and scenario 2 increases to 19 parking spaces. He showed a graph for parking position requirements by time of day and by category. He stated that the peak is driven by the 9p-10p hour which is the most intense combined requirement for parking spots. He stated that there is a smaller peak in the morning because of the remaining overnight positions, and seeing that the least demand is during the day with the aircraft are flying. He stated that in summary, forecasts are based on industry trends and the existing Noise Ordinance, forecasts show a potential increase in activity from the current 2.9 million annual passengers (MAO) to 4.2 MAP under Scenario 1 and 5.0 MAP under Scenario 2. He introduced Mr. Grogan whose presentation will show how forecasts are used to calculate facility requirements.

Mr. Grogan stated that they have spent 5-6 weeks analyzing facility requirements for the Long Beach Airport. It may be expecting too much to give all the detail at one meeting, and stated that the detail is described in the handouts and in the report provided. He stated that his goal is it summarize the findings and hit the high points of the analysis. He stated that their approach to analyzing the facility requirements has been to first look at what the terminal would be, applying industry standard planning factors, and FAA criteria, if it were not constrained. He stated that they reviewed each component to see what that would mean, and compared that with what is in place today. He stated that departing passengers are

those who influence the size of ticketing, baggage, security, and the departure lounges. He stated that arriving passengers put the demand on baggage claim, and all passengers combined influence the size of the restrooms, concessions, and circulation space in the terminal. He stated that what they have done in their analysis, is break the terminal into individual components: airline functions which is ticketing, baggage claim, and departure lounges, the areas that process passengers. Next is the concessions, food and beverage in the secure public area, beyond the security checkpoint, and the restrooms. He stated that non secured public areas is space before the security checkpoint that involves circulation, restrooms, non public areas of the building, support functions, administration offices, and TSA space for office and baggage screening. He stated that they used three factors that they used to analyze the facilities, 1) industry standard planning factors 2) factors that are calculated based on existing utilization, and 3) the FAA Advisory Circular. He stated that the Circular was written in 1994. Load factors are higher now, however, it is a tool that can be used to cross check if the planning factors are in the realm of what the FAA guidelines say. He stated that they looked at ticketing, the counter length, and stated that today Long Beach has one of the highest utilization rates of counter in the industry, that there has not been a planning factor as low as the existing factor. He stated that the industry standard is 10 ½ feet for queing, the line in front of the counter, they have selected a small value of 15 feet. And, for general circulation in the ticket lobby, they have used the standard of 20' of circulation and 10' for seating, kiosk, and ticketing machines. He reviewed the baggage claim requirements, which are based on the planning factor of aircraft arrivals in Mr. Cannan's forecast for both scenarios. He stated that the facility requirements have been done for both scenarios to show the impact of what the difference is between the two. He stated that the claim area industry standard is based on minimum clearances around devices, circulation is based on the industry standard, and the baggage services offices have no current standards. He reviewed the holdroom requirements consisting of lounges includes a gate counter, boarding door aisle, using a formula that is typical in the industry where they have seated 70% passengers on a fully loaded plane. He stated that concourse circulation is the industry standard minimum corridor width; restrooms are sized for all peak hour/average day/ peak month passengers and per code. He reviewed concession requirements and stated that the area should be based on annual enplanements. He reviewed passenger and baggage screening and stated that this is a whole area of functional requirements that are not recognized in the old FAA Advisory Circular. He stated that they have estimates based on planning factors observed at other airports, as well as discussions with TSA. He reviewed the need for office space stating that there is a current shortage at LGB. TSA is authorized for 13,500 square feet of space, and now have only 3,200 square feet. He stated that airline operations have very little space for their operations such as pilot flight control, ramp agent facilities, locker rooms for ramp agents, etc. He reviewed space for airport administration, which is noted in the distributed report. He stated that these spaces should be placed in an area place convenient to the terminal. He stated that the bottomline that they are using the industry standard planning factors, and he believes that they have selected factors that are reasonable and middle of the road. They are not the highest planning factors found in larger airports. Using FAA criteria, they have calculated that a new terminal would require approximately 250,00 square feet for scenario 1 and 2 with some small difference between the two scenarios. He stated that the existing facility is 92,000 square feet of which 30,000 square feet is on the exterior, baggage claim, and circulation area before entering the security checkpoint. He stated that the FAA has some rules of thumb for sizing terminal buildings. HNTB tested their calculations against what the FAA says, and it confirms that the scenarios are in the mid range of the FAA rules of thumb. He stated that HNTB is

recommending a program that does take into account the constraints of LGB, and recognizes that the calculated facility requirements and the rules of thumb would give a building that would not fit on the geometry of the site. He stated that they are aware that the building is historical, with many restrictions and that the operation today is very efficient, and that you would want to use the most efficient use of what is in place. He stated that the bottomline is the recommended program of improvements for enclosed space which would be approximately 104,000 maximum, added to the existing facility, for a total of approximately 150,000 square feet. He stated that he wanted to address the gates and the aircraft parking positions, and showed a graph of mixed sizes of aircraft that would comprise the gates. These are the parking positions associated with the departure lounges, but also space should be provided for the off schedule aircraft and the spare for remain overnight. He stated that he talked about using calculated facility requirements using industry standards and the FAA Advisory Circular, calculated for both scenarios, because the environmental impact assessment needed that comparison. They also looked at a recommended program that is more limited and takes into consideration the constraints of the site, historical building and the unique aspects of the existing terminal. He stated that the program that HNTB has come up with and recommends for consideration would enable Long Beach Airport to process the passengers, under scenario 1, at a reasonable level of service.

Commissioner Alton asked where in the presentation HNTB arrived at the total of 147,450 square feet. Mr. Grogan stated that he could arrive at that figure by using Table 4 which lists the recommended improvements, and also includes existing areas that would remain, by taking the figures in Table 4 and add all the numbers, you would get approximately 100,000 square feet, then add to the existing terminal enclosed areas, it would show a total of approximately 150,000 square feet.

Commissioner Soccio asked about the existing passenger numbers on scenario 1, and if the were figures based on the 36 flights, not 41 flights. Mr. Cannon responded saying that the presentation is based on 36 air carrier flights, 25 commuter flights, and 5 air cargo flights that does not contribute to the passenger numbers. Commissioner Soccio stated that on the projected numbers, and if the airlines stay within the noise bucket, and someone wants to add a flight, are those always going to be air carrier flights. Mr. Cannon stated that their assumptions for scenario 2 are that all additional flights would be passenger flights, in order to create a worst case scenario. Commissioner Soccio asked if there were a second story planned in any of the forecasting. Mr. Grogan stated that in the report it is suggested that office space may be used on a second story space, not necessarily next to the airfield. He stated that the reason they suggest second story is because geometrically the site is constrained, and is likely that that would be advantageous to have a second story for non public space. Commissioner Soccio asked if that were included in the approximate 104,000 square feet. Mr. Grogan stated that they have included 28,000 square feet of office space in the recommendation.

Chairman Salk asked that if there were no second story, would they be able to accommodate 104,000 square feet. Mr. Grogan stated that if that were a requirement, they would do their best to make it fit.

Commissioner Alton asked how many square feet are now being utilized to provide 41 flights per day, and what is the percentage growth to get to from what is provided presently. Mr. Grogan stated that it is near a doubling of the size of the structure. Commission Alton asked

what the capacity of the Airport is today. Mr. Grogan stated that the terminal, as they assess it, is operating at capacity today, there is no additional room at the ticket counters, and no room to move in the lobby during peak times. He stated that the holdrooms are operating at full capacity today and are deficient in circulation space. The entire terminal is operating at a lower than industry standard. Commissioner Alton asked if the airport terminal structure is tripled, and the Airport was to come upon a circumstance where the new tripled airport structure is completely loaded as the current one is with passengers, what would be the size in terms of flights or million passengers enplaned. Mr. Grogan stated that it is the number of aircraft parking positions that determines the capacity of the terminal, it is the planes that are feeding the passengers. He emphasizes that the size of the building does not determine capacity, it is the aircraft parking positions. Commissioner Alton asked in going from 10 to 16 or 19 parking spaces, what is the number of million enplaned passengers per year or flight numbers departing. Mr. Grogan stated that for the facility, that number was not forecasted. Mr. Cannon stated that the projection to 16-19 parking spaces has to take into account the smaller size for commuter aircraft, and a space intended for an off scheduled aircraft, and one spare space. Commissioner Alton stated that they then would triple the size of the airport, and increase parking spaces 60%. Mr. Grogan stated that if they were to do the analysis that they need to recognize that much of the improvements are TSA offices, airport administration space that is badly needed, that are not direct drivers of passenger throughput, and to properly answer the question, HNTB would have to take those things out of the equation to answer it fairly.

Commissioner Haubert asked if space for meeters and greeters is also included in the forecasting analysis, and asked for a review of the existing terminal space numbers. Mr. Grogan stated that 40,000 square feet is enclosed building, 92,000 includes all the outside space, some covered, some not covered, but not conditioned space. He stated that the load factors are nearly 100% today versus 70% typical of O&D airports, and stated that it is impossible to do an apples to apples, there are reasons why more space is needed, one being load factors. He stated that Long Beach's uniqueness and has been taken into consideration. Commissioner Haubert stated that walking through the Sacramento airport, he passed many shops that were empty, and compared it to an area described in HNTB's report, where it is needed to move from the plane to the baggage claim. He stated that he understands that that area is through the holdroom. He stated that their figures show existing concourse circulation of 450 square feet, versus scenario 1 & 2 at 16,000 square feet and 19,000 square feet, and asked if they were counting space twice. Mr. Grogan stated that he is familiar with the Sacramento airport and stated that 9/11 has killed concessions at many airports because they were sized for meeter/greeters to participate. He stated that the 20,000 square foot number that is being proposed is an up-to number and would need the detailed analysis to find the real number. He stated that regarding circulation, with a suggesting 20' average width of circulation aisle, for the length of the holdrooms, that would determine the maximum factor. He stated that you would need more in certain areas and less in other areas. More is needed where passengers are coming through a security checkpoint, more is needed around concessions and restrooms, and less is needed in a single load airport.

Mr. Kunze stated that not all deplaning passengers now go through the holdrooms, and in fact on the north side, they deplane directly through a gate and avoid the holdroom, and that the downside to that is the lack of restrooms. He stated that Long Beach Airport was ranked, of all the 62 medium hub airports, number one in terms of the longest stage length, so that

when passengers arrive, the first thing they do is look for restrooms.

Commissioner Veady asked if the four additional commuter parking slots would be sized smaller than the regular carrier spots, and if they were converted to carrier spots, how many would that accommodate. Mr. Grogan stated that it would be 2 to 1.

Commissioner Temple asked if the level of service is also a level of safety and how would it be compared safety wise for the people in the terminal versus what is being recommended. Mr. Grogan stated that they have not done a safety analysis of the existing facility. He stated that they have not come across anything that shows that the terminal is not safe.

Commissioner Clever questioned if, since 9/11, where the passenger has to arrive earlier and spend that much more time at the gate area, does that have any impact on the size of the holdroom. Mr. Grogan stated that concessions have benefited at some airports because passengers must arrive earlier. He stated that other airports have not been successful because they had a large component of meeter/greeters that typically used the concessions. He stated that each airport is different, and Long Beach has a very long line in the morning and would benefit from more concessions rather than less. Commissioner Clever stated that it would be interesting to know how much time each person spends in the holdroom. Mr. Grogan stated that the holdrooms at LGB are all busy at the same time. Many airports will have one or two lounges active where passengers can spill over, but that typically is not possible at Long Beach because it peaks so strongly that they cannot apply reduction factors used at other airports.

Commissioner Alton asked Mr. Mestre to expand on his assumptions of 6.4 to 11.3 additional flights. Mr. Mestre stated that the 50% reduction in late night activity was completely arbitrary, and there was no way to know how much airlines can improve. He stated that he used 50% in what is called a sensitivity test. He stated that the day/evening/night distribution simply reflects the existing demand for evening operations. They are doing 28% now in the evening, and the assumption is that any new flights will also want to have 28% in the evening. Commissioner Alton stated that his assumption is that if airlines are looking at the benefits of expanding the airport to better utilize it in terms of passenger traffic and the number of parking spots available, that there might be some efficiency benefit derived from that, which would return in terms of fewer nighttime operations. He stated that if they upgrade the airport, there would be fewer late night operations and more planes. Mr. Mestre stated that they look at other airports, at their day, evening, night distribution and the difference between Long Beach and other airports is that of a typical airport, approximately 15% of the operations are in the evening and 10% are at night. He stated that because of the night curfew, those flights get moved into the evening, which gives a greater peak factor.

Chairman Salk asked from questions from the audience.

Mr. Mike Kowal stated that he brought in some 3X5 flyers that say "stop airport expansion" and that someone had removed them from the table. Mr. Kowal asked if he or anyone were allowed to disseminate information at the meetings. Mr. Kunze stated that the material would need to be reviewed for its relevance before having it distributed. Chairman Salk stated that the meetings are not a lobbying arena, and stated that Mr. Kowal had an opportunity to present his position formally. Chairman Salk stated that they cannot allow flyers to be randomly placed at the meetings. He stated that information that is placed on the back table

concerns items that are being discussed, the presentations themselves. He stated that this is not a lobbying venue. Mr. Kowal asked if that were a yes or a no, and that he does not understand. Chairman Salk stated that the place for him to lobby was in his presentation. Mr. Kowal stated that he is lobbying and trying to disseminate information to the Commission as well as the general public. Chairman Salk stated that he does not consider his flyer informational. Chairman Salk asked Mr. Kowal if he considered the orange piece of paper informational, and that he did not consider it so. Mr. Kowal asked Mr. Kunze to read the flyer. Mr. Kunze did so. Mr. Kowal stated that on the flyer it gives information to contact LBHUSH2 that will get information that they have not had time to present at the meetings. Chairman Salk stated that Mr. Kowal and his group have had ample time to give any presentation that they wanted to give. Chairman Salk stated that he has had plenty of time, and takes umbrage at his comments.

Mr. Joe Baez, 4330 Myrtle Street, stated that he has attended some of the meetings, that he reads Long Beach Report .Com to get his information about what is happening in Long Beach, and he accesses the LBHUSH2 website as well. He stated that in listening to the presentations he watches the body language of the Commission and stated that he can see the facial expressions and smirks at comments from the audience, because the Commission may not agree with what is being said. He stated that his perception of what he sees, is that some of the Commissioners are not sensitive to the community's concerns regarding the Airport, and that that disturbs him. He feels that that is an embarrassment regarding the Commission. Chairman Salk stated that all comments are all taken very seriously.

Mr. Robert Taylor stated that regarding Commissioner Haubert's comments on the meeter/greeters space, that TSA is now allowing certain members of the military family to accompany passengers into the boarding lounge, and also they are experimenting nationwide to allow some to pass the security checkpoints without a ticket. He stated that, regarding the comment about space for the aisle to cue for boarding, that people now leaving the security area have to fight their way through people waiting at gate 4. He asked the consultants that in their calculations, was there any consideration for a single building that contains all the square footage.

Mr. Grogan stated that those concerns are addressed in the full report, and that when it comes to security checkpoint and baggage claim, they did make an allowance for two areas, a south and a north section. He stated that looking at the facility requirement analysis using the planning factors, they state that they assumed a consolidated terminal, because it would be more efficient and need less facility. He stated that in the recommended program, he recognize that there are two sides to the airport, and more facility is needed to address its own peak. He gave an example saying that if it were a consolidated terminal where all passengers would use the same baggage claim area, they would have to design for three devices, because it's a split operation, they need four, because each side of the airport experiences a peak that requires two claim units.

Ms. Julie Leishman stated that she uses the Long Beach Airport and that one of the arguments for the concessions is that the airlines do not serve meals, and that she flew JetBlue from New York, on an off peak day and that they had to put portable stairs for deplaning a full flight. She stated that she had to get help with her heavy carry on. She stated that at New York, there were ramps to roll her luggage, but because she had to use the stairs, she had to have help with her luggage. She asked if there are ramps planned for

the terminal. Mr. Grogan stated that Long Beach has not used loading bridges, nor are there any plans to use loading bridges. He stated that the comment on concessions and having the long haul flights create a greater need for concessions. Ms. Leishman asked if they would have ramps to walk down versus the stairs that she had to use. Mr. Grogan stated that ramps may be provided from the building to the apron, but not up to the plane door. Ms. Leishman commented that in picking up her luggage the next day, the baggage claim was so crowded, she was concerned about what it might be like on a weekend. Mr. Grogan stated that their planning factors agree with her experiences, that there is a need for more circulation space and more linear footage of belt, and more devices.

Mr. Sopo stated that he has flown in and out on American Airlines and JetBlue Airways, and that both flights, at peak times were enjoyable in and out of the Airport. He stated that at the last meeting he was asked what he wants as a recommendation to the problem, and that he has thought about that over the last month. He stated that as a Commission, that resources are available, the Commission has more knowledge, the Commission has more people at hand to help find resources, and when will it be that the community hears the Commission recommendations, not necessarily the recommendations that will be passed to the City Council, but recommendations that each Commissioner thinks. Chairman Salk stated that the Committee's thinking is based on what they hear at these public meetings, and June 17th is scheduled for that type of dialogue. Mr. Sopo asked that after June 17th when will the recommendation go to the City Council. Chairman Salk stated that it would be in July. Mr. Sopo asked if it would be a closed door session to make the recommended decision. Chairman Salk stated that it will be an open session, that the Committee will hear the Airport's recommendations, the Committee will consider them, and then take a vote yes or no on this scenario or that scenario, or no growth, no additions, or additions, a judgment will be made after hearing the Airport's formal recommendations on June 17th, and much of the input heard at these meetings will have to have some affect on that decision. He stated that a suggestion made by Mr. Sopo was to close some of the schools, and one of the Commissioners asked if Mr. Sopo had any other recommendations to be made. It would be helpful for the Committee to know what the community, who values air service, but does not want growth, think the is the answer is. Mr. Sopo stated that after his presentation, he spoke to some of the Commissioners and was shocked that some felt that the scope of the recommendations is only the terminal and parking, namely Chairman Salk and Commissioner Clever. He stated that at a meeting with Christine Andersen , Director of Public Works, she confirmed that the Commission was given the charge saying that what ever the Commission wants, they have full latitude, and that the Commission could recommend anything or nothing. Chairman Salk stated that the Commissioners may choose to make their own recommendations after hearing the Airport's recommendations. He asked if there is a question for the consultants. Mr. Sopo stated that he is waiting for TSA to return for a follow up presentation to define the space needed. Chairman Salk stated that TSA does owe additional information. Mr. Sopo asked if that information will be available before June 17th. Mr. Kunze stated that staff has received information when was passed on to the consultants, in terms of LGB now being a category one airport, based on enplanements from last calendar year. He stated that TSA provided the square footage that on a national basis that they are permitted, which was 13,500 square feet. Mr. Sopo asked if that was figured in with the assumptions. The consultants said that it was. Mr. Grogan stated that that is a large number, out of 100,000 it is 13% of the total, and stated that if they take out those types of figures, the total square footage left is not that large of an improvement.

Mr. Jeff Huso stated that possibly some of the problems could be addressed on an individual basis, such as not enough space for the people picking up bags, and stated that contemporary facility size could become obsolete in the future. He stated that his experience at Orange County Airport and other airports is that the buildings seem to be oversized and is a long walk, and wonders about the wisdom of that concept. He stated that Long Beach is already easier to use, less walking distances, and the crowding is never an issue at any time he has used the airport. He asked if the need for the long walking distances is the City's attempt to get money from the concessions, lining the concessions along the long walkways, and believes that those type of things can be viewed as obsolete over time, and wonder if the present building would be more practical. He suggested that it should be looked at independently, apart from just making assumptions that it should look like other facilities seen in other cities. Mr. Grogan stated that HNTB is assuming that aircraft in the foreseeable future are those aircraft that fly today. He stated that he began his career in terminal planning nearly 20 years ago, and aside from TSA and the 9/11 impact and the low fare carrier phenomenon, he has not seen a quantum change in the way terminals operate. He stated that there is still much validity in that book, and it is used as a reference to crosscheck conclusions based on knowledge of the industry. He stated that looking at John Wayne or Ontario, they are similar to Long Beach in that they are single loaded concourses and because of the geometry, walking distances are required to get to the aircraft parking positions. He stated that the linear terminal unfortunately results in longer walking distances.

Mr. David Finch stated that he has used the Airport and personally feels that it is a very convenient airport, a pleasurable experience, and does not feel that it is a third world airport as previously commented. He stated that he would prefer to have a crowded area versus running the risk of expanded flights. He stated that he is concerned with the proposal to expand it so greatly that there would be expanded flights down the road. He asked why the consultants did not look into codes for the terminal and the safety aspects of the terminal. Mr. Grogan stated that the program recommended is not just to better today's traffic, but also to accommodate the additional traffic under scenario 1, and that they are trying to accommodate many things, and safety and security falls within that. He stated that when he said he was not aware of any safety violations, he stated that he is confident that with the improvements that have been done to the terminal that building codes were checked and approved. He stated that the nature of the building may have some grandfathering, due to the unique status of the building.

Ms. Rae Gabelich asked if it is being proposed to remove all the exterior uses of the Airport that exist today. Mr. Grogan stated that that was not recommended. Ms. Gabelich asked if the 30,130 square feet of exterior space would still be used. Mr. Grogan stated that that is essential, and stated that the exterior space is circulation, pre-security, baggage claim area and cueing, and that cueing for security checkpoint is the only exterior space that they recommend to be enclosed. Ms. Gabelich stated that that would be far more than a 30% increase. Mr. Grogan stated that that is correct. Ms. Gabelich asked that under one of the assumptions, it is stated that the analysis assumes that night operations are reduced to 50% of the number flown in 2003, and asked if JetBlue is willing to reduce their night departures, which is JetBlue's most successful flights.

Mr. Alex Wilcox from JetBlue responded saying that they do not believe scenario 2 is realistic, and that they do not believe that they will be reducing any of their flights between 7a-10p when there is a penalty. He stated that they believe scenario 1 is a much more realistic plan.

Ms Gabelich stated that American is not operating at full passenger loads and are planning on holding onto the MD80s. Mr. Kunze stated that it is not known, and in the long run from what is being told by American Airlines is that they are getting rid of the MD80s, and stated that it will be replaced by a much more fuel efficient B737-800 model. He stated that they , as well as other airlines, are going through some cash problems and have slowed down their aircraft acquisitions, in terms of when it will happen, that is not known.

Ms. Gabelich stated that if it were determined that LGB can take additional flights because there is room in the noise bucket, those flights are then allocated and whether they go outside the noise bucket or not, they will remain there for one year before being removed. Mr. Kunze stated that as a general rule the airlines have a year to fly those flights, however, if there is a stipulation that a flight can be flown under certain circumstances, depending on what that stipulation is, that could result in action taken earlier, if the conditions of the stipulation are broken. The agreement will have to stand on what it is at that time. There is no such agreement at this time in terms of implementation, and generally once a decision is made, they have a year to fly it. Ms. Gabelich asked if that is part of the noise ordinance, so that if there were a stipulation, it would be interfering with the noise ordinance. Mr. Kunze stated that that was not accurate. He stated that the noise ordinance very explicitly says that they will not allocate additional flights if it will result in the airlines going over the budget.. Ms. Gabelich stated that that is going under the assumption that there is room for approval of one or two flights. Mr. Kunze stated that that is the key to the issue, the assumption. There may not be an unbridled assumption. The assumption might be that there may only be room under very explicit circumstances, such as aircraft type and time of day for example. Ms. Gabelich stated that that period for that additional flight is for 12 months and is part of the noise ordinance or the agreement overall. Mr. Kunze stated that once there is an allocation, it is for 12 months. Ms. Gabelich asked what percentage load factor was used to show the increase in numbers for aircraft. Mr. Cannon stated that for the commuters it was different according to the carriers, approximately 80%. Ms. Gabelich asked about the commercial flights. Mr. Cannon stated that they also varied between carriers, but estimated at 80%-90% during the peak month. Ms. Gabelich asked what is the difference between one spare and one off scheduled aircraft. Mr. Grogan stated that a spare aircraft is a space that is occupied by an aircraft that is held in reserve in case of mechanical problems or some other problem. He stated that an off scheduled space would typically be empty, but available if there are delays in the departure that causes a gate to continue to be occupied, when an arriving aircraft would need that gate, there would be a space for that arriving aircraft. Ms. Gabelich stated that many times when an aircraft is stranded for the night, that it remains at the gate, and she suggested that that scenario be looked at. She stated that the remain overnight aircraft could also be parked at the departure for an AM departure. Mr. Cannon stated that the parking positions are overlapping. He stated that they do not assume that there are exclusive parking positions for each use category. Ms. Gabelich stated that she is concerned about the projection of 5 million passengers when the statement made by Mr. Kunze projected 4.2 million passengers. She asked if that would not qualify for a full impact EIR. She asked if this makes the 1985 EIR obsolete. Mr. Kunze stated that the EIR will look at

the impacts of the 4.2 million, the revised number. Ms. Gabelich asked if the EIR that is about to be offered will cover the higher figure. She asked then if the EIR will not just focus on the terminal building, but on the result of the terminal building, the increase in passenger loads. Mr. Kunze stated that the background will be adjusted in terms of total passengers in the traffic related impacts.

Mr. Lew Nelson stated that a he believes that scenario seems to be missing and that is to take care of the people that are currently flying and give them adequate service. He stated that in all the scenarios, 25 commuter flights are used, which are not now flying. He asked how many square feet would be needed if the 25 commuter flights were not used. Mr. Grogan stated that they have not done an analysis on that scenario. Mr. Nelson stated that he feels that would be a logical scenario because the airport is only using 41 flights, and that he has heard comments about the 25 commuter flights and that there is no interest. He stated that in building a facility where there is currently is no demand seems to be a wrong direction. He stated that he understands that the noise ordinance states that 25 commuter flight must be considered, but the design does not have to compensate for those flights that are not now available. Mr. Grogan stated that hypothetically 20% of the peak hour traffic, if that were commuter traffic, could reduce the security checkpoint by one lane, from 7 to 6, and the hold room could be reduced by 800-900 square feet, and the circulation associated with that. He stated that if the commuter flights were take out of the mix, there would be percentage reduction size of approximately 20%.

Ms. Gabelich stated that this is a highly emotional subject, and that the Committee will be making a decision that will impact all of the community. She stated that she has been working with LBHUSH2, and Mike Kowal has been standing by her side for nearly three years, and that she finds what happened at tonight's meeting to be offensive. She stated that she understands the Chair's position, but also understands his position. She stated that if his flyer were offensive to someone then they should have said that it was not allowed, but to drive him out of the meeting, after all of the hard work that he has done, she finds it offensive.

Commissioner Luskin stated that it was Mr. Kowal's attitude he resents. He stated that if someone wants to present information, that is one thing. But, he approaches in an attack mode, and tries to attack this Committee. He stated that the Commission is unpaid volunteers, the City has given the Commission a job to do, and they are trying to take in all the information and are offended when attacked for trying to do something that they have been assigned to do. He stated that Mr. Kowal stepped up to the microphone with a chip on his shoulder and immediately started to attack, which precipitated what happened. And, to be fair to the Chair, Mr. Kowal brought on what he did. If he were to address the Committee with a respectful manner, that would not have taken place.

Chairman Salk stated that at the April meeting, Mr. Kowal , in his presentation attacked the Commission uninterrupted. And, according to Chairman Salk, Mr. Kowal was offensive the way he presented himself at the last meeting to nine members of the Commission. He stated that the Commissioners know that he is emotional about it and let him blow of steam, but that he as Chairman would not allow it to happen two meetings in a row.

Commissioner Haubert stated that meetings have changed over time, and that things are heating up at the Airport, and that he has heard offensive comments and has had offensive

comments directed at him, and at Commissioner Soccio, however it was handled in a professional manner. He stated that the Committee has heard both sides of different issues, and will continue to do that. He stated that the Chair may have lost it by using the gavel, as the purpose of the gavel is to calm things and settle the mood so that the meeting can go on in a proper manner. He stated that part of the Commission's duty is to listen and not always to attack back or in any way put up a guard, as the subject is emotional. He stated that the Committee should sit calmly through the end of the process and that no one can say that they were turned away, or shut down, or denied an opportunity to voice their opinion. He stated that if Mr. Kowal were still present that they would hear his comments. He stated that the evening's presentation has been a very informational presentation and the Commission has learned about what industry standards have been recommended, and it has been the most useful night from his perspective.

Chairman Salk stated that the comments are very appreciated, and that the Commission has gone out of its way to do its job and listen to public input, to treat the public respectfully, and that there was a balance that was lost. However, the Committee has endured eight meetings and have invited the public to let the Committee know what they are thinking. He stated that some comments are totally unproductive as was the case tonight.

Commissioner Temple stated that he had asked Mr. Sopo what he wanted and to come back with information on what he wanted. He stated that the ideas are fine, but he still has not heard of what LBHUSH2 wants. He stated that their group has criticized, but that he would still like to know what they expect to happen. Commissioner Alton responded saying that his group, LBHUSH2, will make a formal presentation next week, and that the short answer is that they do not want the ordinance to be challenged and lost.

Mr. Kevin Achren asked if there would be an additional analysis of what is being compromised in convenience and safety for the facility. Mr. Grogan stated that the larger number assumes that everything is in an enclosed building. The 150,000 assumes that the baggage claim areas will be exterior and not enclosed, and there are a number of facilities in the FAA number such as mechanical rooms. He stated that there are a number of things in the bigger number that is not needed at Long Beach. Mr. McAchren asked that if half if it is thrown out, there is still a discrepancy of 50,000 square feet. He asked if there is a more detailed description of what will be given up. Mr. Grogan stated that an analysis could show that description. Mr. Kunze stated that they will address that when giving staff recommendations on June 17th.

Mr. Sopo stated that the figure of 150,000 square feet is simply a sales technique, where in fact it will be three times larger.

Mr. Huso stated that his recommendation is that he does not want any expansion of the facilities except possibly an increase to the baggage belt. Otherwise leave the facilities as they are.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dottie Jones

Airport Secretary

Long Beach Airport

Approved